

good is a no interest loan let alone a low interest loan when you are losing money each year." Their attitude is that our government seems to want the small farmer to disappear and all we will have left is large corporate farms controlled by a few large conglomerates, and I tend to agree with them.

My Dad is not a large farmer; he only farms 500 acres of wheat and soybeans, but his story is sadly going to be repeated over and over again in 1999. Dad is an excellent businessman, and he is one of the most frugal people I know, but low commodity prices have forced him out of farming. On average Dad lost approximately \$100 per acre in 1998, and he will lose approximately that much again in 1999. Cotton growers will lose more than that, so you can see what a larger farmer will lose. Our pork producers are facing the same dilemmas as you well know.

Congress must act now, Ms. Emerson, or a way of life that is very dear to me will disappear. Give our farmers legislation that gives them a level playing field in the world markets. Farmers do not need rhetoric from Washington; they need help, and they need it now.

I hope you get a chance to address this issue at our Field Day on Sept. 2nd, and I hope that you can give our farmers some much needed encouragement. I am from Missouri, and our legislators have to show me that they truly care about the plight of our small family farms. I know that you care because you are doing something, please keep up the good work and please keep telling our farmer's story in Washington.

I do not believe many of our legislators realize how serious the problem is, but I know you do.

Again thank you for your tireless efforts on behalf of our farmers, and I wish you health and happiness—especially in your new marriage.

Respectfully yours,

BILL FARIS.

STOP THE KILLING IN EAST TIMOR

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1999

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the violence and bloodshed in recent days in East Timor has shocked the world. Pro-Indonesia thugs have run rampant in this tiny former Portuguese colony, killing pro-independence Timorese. The political leadership in Jakarta totally failed in its guarantee of safety to the local Timorese populace, and has become the source of shame both for the government and the Indonesian military.

It is clear that an international peacekeeping force will be necessary to restore order in East Timor. As the Omaha World Herald correctly noted in a September 14, 1999, editorial entitled "First, Stop the Killing," this bloody repression must be stopped. "This is too early to talk about resolving the sides' differences. For now it is enough simply to separate them and try to calm the situation."

Mr. Speaker, this Member commends to this colleagues the excellent editorial in the Omaha World Herald.

FIRST, STOP THE KILLING

Few Americans take any joy in the prospect of sending peacekeeping troops into the

violence and intrigues of East Timor. But the situation is relieved greatly by the announcement that Indonesian President B.J. Habibie now welcomes them.

International pressure was mounting to somehow stop the bloodletting. Having to subdue both pro-Indonesian militias and troops, while at the same time strong-arming the legitimate Indonesian government, would have been a daunting prospect. Now Habibie has conceded the obvious—his defense forces can't control the situation—and so relief may be in sight within a few days. Australia, which is literally in the neighborhood, expects to send a force of up to 7,000 on short-notice deployment.

This is appropriate, given the geography and the fact that Australia has been among the staunchest advocates of intervention. It will be at least as appropriate when other nations of Asian ethnicity in that part of the world can supplement Australia's effort. So far, at least, this is a regional problem in need of regional solutions.

For these reasons, it also is right for the United States basically to stay out—at least for the short term, and possibly for the long. U.S. armed forces taking part are likely to number in the hundreds. Their role would be in support functions—what National Security Adviser Sandy Berger characterized as "airlift to bring forces to the region, logistical and transportation capabilities, communications capabilities."

The boiling over of East Timor can't be justified, but in hindsight the degree to which it caught the international community napping is a little surprising. Indonesia, which sprawls over 17,000 islands and encompasses hundreds of ethnicities and languages, is a nation that for half a century has been held together by smoke, mirrors and the threat of just what is happening now; violent repression.

East Timor's U.N.-sponsored vote for independence was perceived by the militias and the military as a foretaste of similar efforts in other independence-minded regions, of which there are several. And since by the military's and militia's perception, they have only one tool with which to "repair" the situation, that's the tool they're using.

The whole world is watching the rivers of blood that are the result. It cries out to be stopped. This is too early to talk about resolving the sides' differences. For now it is enough simply to separate them and try to calm the situation.

Down the road, better solutions are needed—in part for humanitarian reasons, but also for practical ones. Indonesia is flung across a vast reach of water linking the Pacific and Indian oceans, and through this maze of islands threads a major oil-shipping lane. The effects of disrupting that could ripple through economies worldwide.

For now, though, the most urgent need has just one focus: Stop the killing. It's heartening to see events there aimed toward that end.

THE INFLUENCE OF CUBAN AMERICANS

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1999

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend to you the attached article written by Mr. Frank Calzon, entitled "Blame Castro,

not the Cubans." Mr. Calzon is the executive director of the Center for a Free Cuba in Washington, DC, and is a tireless fighter for democratic causes. I believe Mr. Calzon makes an excellent case in his article and I encourage my colleagues to learn from it.

BLAME CASTRO, NOT THE CUBANS

Although prejudice can be found anywhere, Americans might be shocked that bigotry has raised its ugly head in the upper reaches of the Clinton administration.

The pugnacious debate about Cuba has grown uglier since The New York Times quoted unnamed administration officials asserting that Cuban Americans hold U.S.-Cuba policy hostage. If this were said about the NAACP's interest in South Africa, or the Jewish-American community's concerns about Israel, cries of outrage against such bigotry would resound across America.

While critics might object to the influence of Cuban Americans, interest groups (ethnic, regional, professional, corporate, etc.) are simply a fact of life. When Cuban Americans write to their members of Congress, they are exercising their right to petition the government for redress of grievances. When my sisters attend a political rally, they are enjoying the right of assembly guaranteed by the Constitution. Until now, I believed that when my parents register and vote, they are fulfilling a civic responsibility. But now I know that "a senior government official" thinks that what they are really doing is "holding U.S. policy hostage."

To note the virulent attacks on the Cuban-American community is not to assert that its members are exempt from responsibility for the shrillness of the debate. We are not. But it might be instructive to remember that whether it was workers attempting to unionize 100 years ago, African Americans demanding an end to discrimination in the 1960s, or women struggling to achieve equality today, the victims of great injustices are sometimes a nuisance to those not interested in their plight.

What could Cuban Americans say that would be so objectionable?

That the administration's accords with Fidel Castro have been negotiated in such secrecy that sometimes not even the Cuba desk at the Department of State is informed.

That the "adjustments" in Cuba policy are often presented as *fait accompli*, ignoring the Congress and U.S. laws.

That the government's spinning and lawyerly hair-splitting over-shadow Cuba policy, promoting a mind-set that believes in giving Castro the benefit of the doubt. The most recent example: the suggestion that a legal opinion is needed to determine whether the embargo statutes prohibit not only American sales to the Cuban government but also sales through the Cuban regime.

The debate provides a sobering commentary on the values held by some American elites on the eve of the 21st Century.

For some, Castro is the one remaining beacon in a pantheon that once included Josef Stalin, Mao Zedong and Ho Chi Minh. As long as Castro or North Korea's Kim Jong Il, the son of the deceased Kim Il Sung, remain in power, it can be said that the socialist experiment has not been a complete fiasco.

Yet the American people have an instinctive aversion to tyranny and object to providing assistance that could lengthen Castro's rule. Most Americans agree that the problem is Castro, not the Cuban Americans. Because Castro refuses to base U.S.-Cuban relations on any—sort of reciprocity—and certainly because of his abhorrent human-rights